UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,277	08/27/2003	Takayuki Tsutsumi	Q77174	4437
23373 SUGHRUE MI	7590 02/11/200 ON. PLLC	EXAMINER		
2100 PENNSY	LVANIA AVENUE, N	CHRISS, ANDREW W		
SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			02/11/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/648,277	TSUTSUMI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	Andrew Chriss	2419	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>27 January 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	RALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appetor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance v	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth i ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on thortened statutory period for reply original than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	201100
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, k (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bether the content of the cont	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21. See attached Notice of Non-Cor	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		,	,
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Hassan Kizou/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed January 27, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states that Takayama fails to disclose the claim limitations of a mobile terminal comprising "an access point search unit for searching for peripheral connectable access points and for obtaining access point data" and "an access point data table in which the access point data detected and obtained by the access point search unit are recorded. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Takayama discloses a mobile terminal comprising a wireless LAN interface (Figure 3, 32) and a CPU that scans and monitors beacons for peripheral access point data (paragraphs 0009, 0010, 0055) and downloads access point hopping information for storage in memory (paragraphs 0077-0081). The CPU in the mobile station is capable of searching the memory in which the access point data is received to check that hopping information of registered neighboring access points are saved and registered (paragraph 0080). The term "access point data" in the claim language is not further defined to include or exclude certain types of information. Therefore, given its broadest reasonable interpretation, the hopping information downloaded from the access points by the mobile terminals, as described in paragraphs 0077-0081 of Takayama, discloses the claim limitation of "an access point search unit...for obtaining access point data." Further, the scanning operation disclosed by Takayama and described above, wherein the mobile terminal scans beacons for access points, discloses the claim limitation of "an access point search unit for searching for peripheral connectable access points." Lastly, the hopping information associated with each of the access points is stored in memory, along with "radio situation" data associated with each access point stored in a database (paragraph 0081), discloses the claim limitation of "an access point data table in which the access point data detected and obtained by the access point search unit are recorded." Therefore, rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is maintained..